



# Planning Committee

Lodge Park Ward

4 November 2008

---

2008/305/OUT

**OUTLINE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT  
LAND AT WIREHILL DRIVE, LODGE PARK  
APPLICANT: PROPERTY SERVICES, REDDITCH BOROUGH COUNCIL  
EXPIRY DATE: 22 DECEMBER 2008**

## Site Description

(See additional papers for Site Plan)

Sloping piece of grass to rear of properties 1-7 Gaydon Close, located adjacent the Warwick Highway and Wirehill Drive.

## Proposal description

This is an outline application for residential development with all matters reserved for future consideration (access, layout, scale, appearance and landscaping).

## Relevant key policies

All planning applications must be considered in terms of the planning policy framework and all other relevant material considerations (as set out in the legislative framework). The planning policies noted below can be found on the following websites:

[www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

[www.wmra.gov.uk](http://www.wmra.gov.uk)

[www.worcestershire.gov.uk](http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk)

[www.redditchbc.gov.uk](http://www.redditchbc.gov.uk)

### ***National Planning Policy***

PPS1 (& accompanying documents) Delivering sustainable development  
PPS3 Housing

### ***Regional Spatial Strategy***

UR4 Social infrastructure  
CF5 Delivering affordable housing and mixed communities  
QE3 Creating a high quality built environment for all

### ***Worcestershire County Structure Plan***

IMP1 Implementation of development

### ***Borough of Redditch Local Plan No. 3***

CS6 Implementation of development  
CS7 Sustainable location of development  
CS8 Landscape character  
S1 Designing out crime  
B(HSG).1 Housing provision  
B(HSG).4 Density of development  
B(HSG).5 Affordable housing  
B(HSG).6 Development within or adjacent to the curtilage of an existing dwelling  
B(BE).13 Qualities of good design  
B(NE).6 Contaminated land  
CT5 Walking routes  
CT6 Cycle routes  
R2 Protection of incidental open space

### ***SPDs***

Encouraging good design  
Design for community safety  
Planning obligations for education contributions  
Open space provision  
Affordable housing

### **Relevant site planning history**

None

### **Public Consultation Responses**

#### Responses in favour

None received

#### Responses against

7 comments received raising the following points:

- Mature hedgerow across site should be retained/protected
- 'Environmental'
- Previous history
- Increase in traffic would cause noise/disturbance/safety concerns
- Loss of green space
- Increase in noise from Warwick Highway due to loss of landscaping

#### Petition

A petition of 12 signatures has been received from residents raising concerns of subsidence, road safety, site history and loss of green space.

Other issues which are not material planning considerations have been raised, but are not reported here as they cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

## **Consultation responses**

### ***Environmental Health Officer***

No objection subject to conditions regarding construction times and the submission of a noise assessment at reserved matters stage (relating to the detailed proposal) and informatives regarding lighting and odour control.

### ***County Highway Network Control***

No objection subject to informatives regarding the design of the future proposals

### ***Crime Risk Manager***

No objection subject to condition and informative to ensure that security and safety are designed into any scheme on this site

### ***Drainage Officer***

No response received

### ***County Education Team***

Identified need for contributions in relation to three local schools, in compliance with the adopted SPG

### ***Severn Trent Water***

No objection subject to a condition regarding drainage details

## **Procedural matters**

This is an outline application with all matters reserved, and as such, only the principle of development can be considered at this stage, as no details are available. However, if there are reasons why the development could not be designed to be appropriate to the site, these can be raised as concerns at this stage.

The application plans and documents include an indicative layout, however this is for illustrative purposes only to demonstrate how the site *could* be developed, and not how it *would* be developed. This therefore has no weight in the determination of the application.

Under normal circumstances, some matters might be required through entering into a S106 planning obligation to ensure the provision of certain matters. However, in this case the applicant is the Council, and the Council as Planning Authority cannot enter into an agreement with itself as land owner. Therefore, in this case, conditions can be attached in the place of an obligation. Should the site be sold and then subsequent applications be made by the new owner/developer, then a planning obligation could be

entered into at that stage if necessary in order to ensure future control and provision of facilities as necessary.

## **Assessment of proposal**

The key issue for consideration in this case is the principle of the development, as all other matters are reserved for future consideration. As part of this, matters regarding density, sustainability and planning obligations can be considered.

### Principle

The site is mostly designated as Primarily Open Space within the Local Plan, where Policy R1 applies. A smaller portion of the site is undesignated within the Local Plan and thus can be considered as incidental open space under Policy R2. Policy R1 is a criteria based policy, whereby in assessing applications for development on Primarily Open Space certain factors will be taken into account. These factors and your Officers responses to these are listed as follows:

*i), The environmental and amenity value of the area.*

Given the topography of the land the site has no particular or notable amenity value.

*ii) The recreational, conservation, wildlife, historical and visual and community amenity value of the site.*

The site as a whole performs a visual open space function but has little wildlife etc. generally. It could be beneficial to retain some open space on the application site.

*iii), The merits of retaining the land in its existing open use, and, the contribution or potential contribution the site makes to the character and appearance of the area.*

The site makes a contribution to the open character and appearance of Wirehill Drive, however not all of the site would need to continue to be undeveloped to achieve this.

*iv) The merits of protecting the site for alternative open space uses.*

It would be difficult to suggest appropriate alternative open space uses on the site given the topography of the land.

v) *The location, size and environmental quality of the site.*

The location, size and quality of the open space is considered to be compromised by the sites close proximity to Wirehill Drive.

vi) *The relationship of the site to other open space areas in the locality and similar uses within the wider area.*

There are other open spaces within Lodge Park, including the Lodge Park Pool area, which lies within 300 metres of the site by means of the nearest footpath.

vii) *Whether the site provides a link between other open areas or a buffer between incompatible land uses.*

In this case the site neither provides a link between other open areas nor a buffer between incompatible land uses.

viii) *That it can be demonstrated that there is a surplus of open space and that alternative provision of equivalent or greater community benefit will be provided in the area at an appropriate, accessible locality.*

The Councils Open Space Needs Assessment shows that there is a deficit and therefore no surplus of open space in the Lodge Park ward.

ix) *The merits of the proposed development to the local area or the Borough generally.*

It is understood that the merits to the Borough generally are for a built leisure initiative.

The assessment of the site in relation to the above criteria has shown that the site performs a visual open space function and that it lies in a ward with a deficit of open space in relation to the Borough average. For these reasons your Officers consider that it would be important not to build on the whole of the site. It is considered that the triangular area which is incidental open space and subject to Policy R2 in the Local Plan should remain free from development. This serves to protect the hedgerow and maintain the visual amenity of the flatter area of the site in relation to Wirehill Drive.

The site measures 0.68ha and therefore development at a minimum of 30dph as recommended in PPS3 would result in at least 21 dwellings on this site. The surrounding character and pattern of development varies between approximately 36-60dph, and therefore it is considered that development could occur on this site in such a way that it would be acceptable and not inappropriate to the surrounding area.

Any impacts from development on this site in relation to noise clearly cannot be considered fully until a detailed design is proposed. Therefore, in order to enable full consideration of these issues at reserved matters

stage, it is recommended that a condition be attached requiring the submission of a noise assessment to accompany that submission.

### Sustainability

The site lies within the urban area of Redditch, and is therefore considered to be in a sustainable location. The applicant has provided a plan demonstrating the links to the site with the cycle and public transport provision in the area, and it is considered that the site could be accessed by a variety of modes of transport, in line with planning policy objectives.

### Planning obligations

The size of the proposed development is above the policy threshold for requiring contributions which should be sought via a planning obligation:

- A contribution towards County education facilities would normally be required, and the County have confirmed that there is a need in this area to take contributions towards three schools – Oakhill First, Woodfield Middle and Trinity High;
- A contribution towards playing pitches, play areas and open space in the area, due to the increased demand/requirement from future residents, is required in compliance with the SPD;
- If the reserved matters application to follow proposes more than 14 units this Council would also require that 40% of the dwellings be provided as affordable units for social housing in line with SPD policy. A clause should be included in the agreement to ensure the retention of the units for this purpose in perpetuity.

As noted above, a planning obligation cannot be entered into in this case, however these matters can all be achieved through the imposition of a condition.

### Other issues

There are no concerns or objections raised by consultees, and therefore the issues raised by residents in relation to highway matters and traffic noise cannot be substantiated, and thus the proposal is considered to be acceptable. Matters of design that could result in details are submitted for consideration.

### Conclusion

The proposal is considered to comply with the planning policy framework and unlikely to cause harm to amenity or safety and as such is therefore considered to be acceptable.

## Recommendation

**That having regard to the development plan and to other material considerations, planning permission be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:-**

1. Time limit for commencement of development and for submission of reserved matters, including definition of reserved matters to follow.
2. Planning obligation content requirements at reserved matters stage
3. Limit on operating hours during construction
4. Noise assessment to accompany reserved matters application unless made only for access or landscaping details.
5. Secured by design principles to be incorporated into reserved matters scheme and a statement submitted with application(s) to demonstrate how this has been done

## Informatives

1. Lighting
2. Odour control
3. Highways
4. Sewer locations
5. Secured by design – note comments of Crime Risk Manager